

Meeting: Columbia River Crossing Task Force
Date: February 27, 2007, 4:00pm
Location: Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1
 123 NW Flanders St., Portland, OR

Members Present:

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Alternate Attending
Adams	Sam	City of Portland	
Armbruster	Grant	Portland Business Alliance	
Bennett	Mike	City of Gresham	
Brown	Rich	Bank of America	
Burkholder	Rex	Metro	
Byrd	Bob	Identity Clark County	
Caine	Lora	Friends of Clark County	
Cruz-Walsh	Serena	Multnomah County	
Dengerink	Hal	Wash. State University- Vancouver	
Eki	Elliott	Oregon/Idaho AAA	
Frei	Dave	Arnada Neighborhood Association	
Fuglister	Jill	Coalition for a Livable Future	
Grossnickle	Jerry	Columbia River Towboat Association	
Hamm	Jeff	C-TRAN	
Hansen	Fred	TriMet	
Hewitt	Henry	Stoel Rives, LLP	
Imeson	Tom	Port of Portland	
Isbell	Monica	Starboard Alliance Company, LLC	
Knight	Bob	Clark College	
Lookingbill	Dean	Regional Transportation Council	
Malin	Dick	Central Park Neighborhood Assn.	
Paulson	Larry	Port of Vancouver	
Pollard	Royce	City of Vancouver	
* Pursley	Larry	Washington Trucking Association	
Russel	Bob	Oregon Trucking Association	
Schlueter	Jonathan	Westside Economic Alliance	
* Schmidt	Karen	Washington Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board	
Strahan	Elson	Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust	
Stuart	Steve	Clark County	
Sundvall-Williams	Jeri	Environmental Justice Action Group	
Tischer	Dave	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	
Valenta	Walter	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association	
Walstra	Scot	Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce	
Zelenka	Tom	Schnitzer Group	

Number of guests present: 105

Project Staff Present:

Ron Anderson
 Danielle Cogan
 Doug Ficco
 Tonja Gleason
 Frank Green
 Heather Gunderson
 Barbara Hart
 Michael Harrison
 Zachary Horowitz
 Ryan LeProwse
 Jay Lyman
 Tom Markgraf
 Colin McConnaha
 Barbara MacKay
 Kay McLoughlin
 Linda Mullen
 John Osborn
 Peter Ovington
 David Parisi
 Lynn Rust
 Carolyn Sharp
 Lynette Shaw
 Leon Skilles
 Gregg Snyder
 Audri Streif
 Kris Strickler
 Rex Wong

Members Absent:

Halverson	Brad	Overlook Neighborhood Association
Lynch	Ed	Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Osborn	Dennis	City of Battle Ground
Phillips	Bart	Columbia River Economic Development Council
Ray	Janet	Washington AAA

* Task force members present via phone

1. Welcome & Announcements

• Welcome to new members

- Tom Imeson is the director of Public Affairs for the Port of Portland and will be the Port's new representative on the Task Force. He replaces Bill Wyatt.
- Mike Bennett, Gresham City Councilor will be representing the City of Gresham. Mayor Shane Bemis will serve as alternate.

2. Meeting Summary Approval

- **Action:** Approved – Draft summary of January 23, 2006 Task Force meeting

3. Public Comment (27 commentors)

- **Barbara Nelson** – Resident and member of board of directors for Jantzen Beach Moorage. Employee at Jantzen Beach State Welcome Center where she sees safety problems first hand. Asserted that decision is needed now so a third bridge can be considered sooner. Spoke about aspects of living at the Jantzen Beach Moorage such as resident ownership of moorage, long term residency, 90% owner occupancy rate, unusually close community ties, and the large investments residents have made in their property. Spoke in favor tolling, light rail, and an upstream replacement bridge due to it having fewer impacts on Hayden Island residents.
- **Tom Mielke** – Served as a citizen and as a Washington State legislator on transportation issues for over twelve years. Cautioned that accepting the staff recommendation was premature and argued against claims that the current bridges were unsound for seismic and age reasons. Stated that a larger bridge would not remove congestion but would have a negative impact on air quality and referred to previous work he did as a legislator which concluded that the I-5 corridor could not feasibly be fixed. Raised issues with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process of the CRC project so far such as location and frequency of meetings. Suggested that the task force slow down and take a step back.
- **Terry Parker** – (Testimony submitted, see **Appendix 1**). Stated project was set to fail by an overly rigorous Purpose and Need statement that unfairly eliminates more affordable options. Raised issues with light rail's connection not serving most commuters, discrepancies between those benefiting from and those paying for tolls, failure to recognize the diversity of drivers' needs, and a lack of bike counts to prove need for, or bike tolls to support investment in, bike lanes. Advocated stopping process to find middle ground options that retain current bridges. Gave ideas for alternatives.
- **Jim Howell** – Stated support for Metro's resolution. Spoke of need to incorporate expertise of transit and railroad engineers as well as urban planners into work already done by highway engineers.
- **Vinton Erickson** – Farmer in Vancouver who ships produce across the bridge. Commented that the bridges are overloaded and if truck traffic doubles in 20 years, there will be no room for anyone to drive. Cited an *Oregonian* article from March 20, 1989 by a Pacific University professor and member of Oregon Transportation Commission. Article proposed a western bypass of I-5 which could form a beltway with I-205. Stated that this idea was still applicable and necessary.
- **Dan McFarling** – Aloha resident. Cautioned that a focus on congested pavement would waste money, time, and lives because such an approach could only move the bottleneck and worsen air pollution. Said that approach being used by CRC is antiquated and asserted it should focus instead on finding ways to efficiently move people and freight while best conserving land and resources.

- **Sharon Nasset** – Argued that the lack of support of the staff recommendation options by various transportation groups indicated that the options would not meet NEPA criteria. Referred to Metro's session on CRC and the resolutions which passed there. Claimed that there was a void in CRC's public outreach and involvement. Stated the need for additional options but questioned the right of the task force to determine those without going back to their constituencies and groups first.
- **Jon Haugen** – Native Portlander now living in Vancouver. Stated that none of the proposals meets community needs and advised group to look outside the region for new answers. Endorsed an expressway from SR-14 to I-405 and a commuter rail line from Longview to Portland.
- **Paul Edgar** – Original Vancouver resident who commuted in corridor for 14 years. Asserted the necessity of another alternative due to the current I-5 corridor being broken. Stated that any of these options would only create more congestion. Linked congestion with emissions and air quality issues. Cited these types of emissions as the cause of many illnesses and deaths, including his father's. Asked the task force not to perpetuate this type of problem and to come up with an alternative that would not induce more vehicles into the I-5 corridor. Warned that increasing congestion would kill people and businesses and asserted that the group could do better.
- **Ray Polani** – Resident of Portland. Stated support for Metro, Coalition for a Livable Future, Clark County Commission, and other groups who wanted a change in the direction of the process. Referenced a Feb. 11 *Oregonian* article on a study which identified five major choke points on I-5, including the I-5 Bridge. Referenced Feb. 23 *Portland Tribune* article that claimed over \$9 billion was needed to fix the area's roads and highways without including the CRC project. Read from a Feb. 3, 2007 *Oregonian* letter to the editor emphasizing the need for light rail, implications of rising gas prices, and consideration of spending money elsewhere on freight and passenger rail improvements. Concluded that the group should not build an expensive project that increases congestion in light of the current concerns about global warming and dependency on foreign oil.
- **Chris Smith** – Referred to Eddington report which claimed that the most beneficial transportation planning focus is on how to best operate what is already in place (through methods such as pricing). Read excerpt which warned against making transportation projects into the "pursuit of icons," asserted that resources are better used in other, less exciting ways, and that macro-investments are huge risks which are rarely assessed against other alternatives. Insisted that the group needed to look for better ways to achieve the same or better goals by spreading the money around.
- **John Leber** – Owner of Longview mulch company that ships by trucks. Commented that even if trucks could average 30 mph, his company would save a lot of money. Stated current situation is a bottleneck which could be improved. Expressed concern for area's economic future if businesses were forced to move due to transportation issues. Urged task force to approve recommendation.
- **Jason Barbour** – Member of Sellwood Bridge community task force and part of former committee to save C-TRAN, speaking on behalf of himself. Stated that the costs are a problem and designers are not considering what the community can or wants to pay for. Also held that light rail should be Clark County's decision and that their transit agencies should be in charge of it.
- **Rev. Phil Sano** – Commented that he is excited about the amount of public input and that it shows the project is an important issue. Cited a love of Portland based in its consideration of the impacts of what is built. Asserted that a project built for cars would bring more cars to the area. Commented on the dangers of cars and that many people do not want to see more of them.
- **TJ Harrison** – Lewis and Clark College student. Mentioned environmental and social issues education which shows building more lanes only increases congestion and stated she has seen Portland do more visionary things than that. Stated that adding more lanes is an environmental justice and public health issue due to the congestion it would cause at the Rose Garden. Stated opposition to staff recommendation and urged the project to be more creative and for commuters to reconsider options.

- **Fred Nussbaum** – Testifying on behalf Assn. of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates (AORTA). Supported Metro resolution, consideration of another alternative, and more extensive analysis. Stated no alternative considered has taken a comprehensive view and included a local traffic bridge along with interchange reconfiguration and correction of the railroad bridge swing-span. Claimed there are only two alternatives in the staff recommendation and that it is not in the spirit or legal parameters of NEPA. Also testified on behalf of self. Urged task force not to base decision on majority vote. Claimed a straight vote could divide the community and that a consensus was needed.
- **Jim Karlock** – (Appendix 2) Found the lack of cost-benefit assessment to be a fatal flaw in the process. Gave an estimate that if a four lane bridge is \$200 million, then 30 to 40 bridges could be built with the same amount of money being discussed. Brought up the success of RC-14 on all criteria except transit and bike/ped, and stated that with a small secondary bridge those could be addressed. Questioned the cost-benefit of MAX and bike/ped accommodations.
- **Kristine Perry** – Member of Community Choices 2010 for Vancouver, WA. Stated that decision will have a long term impact on health and quality life. Encouraged task force, on behalf of the Steps to a Healthier Clark County program, to find sustainable solutions that encourage physical activity, discourage single occupancy vehicles, and provide viable transportation options. Emphasized concern over lack of equitable attention to bike/ped systems. Referenced national research which proved direct relationship between individual health, community walkability, transportation systems, and the built environment and connected this to concern over the levels of obesity in Clark County. Urged task force to convene a formal bike/ped group and to include a member of the Steps to a Healthier Clark County program in it.
- **Sylvia Evans** – North Portland resident and regular commentor. Stated she was there on behalf of her family, friends and neighbors, three of whom were hospitalized from impaired lung function that weekend, and one who died earlier from heart failure and impaired lung function. Stated North Portland residents were being poisoned and that it was necessary to reconsider the project and its decisions in terms of cleaner air, not more cars.
- **Kate Iris-Hilburger** – Student at Lewis and Clark College. Commented on relationship between these types of projects and the devastating displacement of low income communities. Cited that Portland has evolved creative solutions to these problems before and urged each member of the task force to seek those types of solutions and to emphasize justice issues.
- **David Rowe** – Battle Ground resident. Talked about his family's car use patterns and the high cost of it. Encouraged development of park and ride system and stated wish to use mass transportation. Referred to a study of commuter heavy rail use from Battle Ground. Claimed it would be less costly since much of the right of way is already owned and would serve the majority of the area. Pointed out many opportunities for C-TRAN and MAX connections and that the same equipment could have multiple uses. Showed map that indicated the specific route he was referencing.
- **Corky Collier** – Executive Director of Columbia Corridor Association and Member of the CRC Freight Working Group. Stated the I-5 corridor is home to over 2,500 businesses, is Oregon's largest business corridor, and is also Portland's industrial sanctuary. Stated that it is a major economic hindrance that the most congested spot on the interstate corridor is wrapped on both sides by the region's most important economic areas. Urged task force to support staff recommendation and to use the DEIS process to look at alternatives and consider air quality.
- **Jessica Lazar** – Student at Lewis and Clark College. Referred to *Reader's Digest* naming Portland as the "cleanest city" and stated that the US looks to Portland for innovative solutions to environmental and human rights issues. Commented that human rights are at stake and it was morally impermissible to displace residents or contribute to deaths via poor air quality if alternatives existed. Affirmed belief in another alternative which would be able to set a standard for other places.
- **Carl Larson** – From Boston. Commented on the potential of CRC to become something akin to Boston's Big Dig in terms of ill-spent money. Asserted that Portland needs to look at transit as hope, that a replacement bridge was not buildable, and that the number of public commentors speaking against the recommendation was indicative of the community's feelings.

- **Megan McBride** – Stated that she did not believe staff recommendation would meet goals of improved safety, mobility, and reliability on I-5. Stated more lanes would fill up and shift bottleneck to Rose Quarter. Urged the focus of project to be on the structural causes of increasing commuter traffic. Stated support for high capacity transit options. Advised group to look at who are having their needs met and who are suffering the impacts, especially in regards to North Portland residents.
- **Susan Morton** – Commented on need to have an even sharing of costs between the states. Stated that a replacement bridge option wasn't good enough and that a new corridor is needed for freight. Also stated that Clark County should choose light rail on its own.
- **William Barnes** – Private citizen who has followed project for four months. Stated that there was a need to start over and find another alternative. Identified problems which make the current process such as a cost not being nailed down, important advocacy groups not being brought in, ignoring of advocacy groups that are involved, and the lack of consensus among stakeholders.

4. Report from the Community and Environmental Justice Group

<p>NOTE: <i>Task Force questions and comments are in italics,</i> <i>Staff responses are in plain text</i></p>
--

- Letter from Community and Environmental Justice Group read by Dave Frei. Group took position that it could neither accept nor decline staff recommendation at the time of the meeting due to lack of information on health and environmental impacts, displacement impacts, and alternative corridor placement.

--Henry Hewitt – More information on the issues the group has identified will be found in the DEIS phase. They will be dealt with in great detail at that time.

--Jill Fuglister – Is the group asking the task force to defer a decision until there is more information?

--Dave Frei – That is where we are at. It feels like this is being driven home without enough information.

--Henry Hewitt– We expect to gather this information on all the alternatives that move forward.

--Jeri Sundvall-Williams – This is a group of brilliant and dedicated volunteers. We didn't have a full sense of environmental justice when I left, but you have gained it and leadership since then. I have full confidence in your not knowing how to vote because I am there too.

5. Report on Public Comment and Open Houses

- Presentation by **Danielle Cogan**

--Rex Burkholder – We had a long public comment period at the Metro Council session on the resolution I've brought. There was a misconception about a lack of public involvement. This is a good response.

--Jill Fuglister – I feel like there are missing pieces in the way that the comment form questions have been framed. I thought that we were supposed to have been given a draft of the comment form.

Danielle Cogan – There was some narrowness to the questions but open ended responses were invited too. The form went through three iterations based on public feedback. Task force review of the forms was not something that I understand to have been proposed earlier nor carried out for these.

--Hal Dengerink– Wanted to clarify that public comment is not finished.

Danielle Cogan – Public comment is involved at every level. We took on an aggressive outreach plan to make sure people were aware of the staff recommendation. As we move into the next parts dealing with issues like impacts, we will continue to do so. We will accept any feedback on how to better serve in this manner.

6. Recommendation on Transit and River Crossing Alternatives for DEIS

- Presentation recapping the *Staff Recommendation*, by **Doug Ficco** and **John Osborn**

--Sam Adams – *Could you clarify the position of the federal regulatory agencies? Coast Guard has intimated that they want a new structure. Do they have a veto?*

Doug Ficco – Yes, they are the ones who permit where piers can be built.

--Rex Burkholder – *I would like to see tolling as part of CRC's TDM as well as at the regional level.*

--Steve Stuart – *How many lanes are being recommended to move forward?*

Doug Ficco – Five or six in each direction made up of three through lanes and two or three auxiliary lanes for operational purposes.

--Steve Stuart – *The total of that number of lanes, shoulders, lanes for High Capacity Transit, and widened bike/ped facilities is approximately 228 ft wide. How could that not divide Vancouver and the Reserve?*

Jay Lyman – Only through lanes will extend further into corridor. The others dive down into Vancouver right after the bridge.

--Sam Adams – *There was a comment raised during public comments – has there been no investigation of seismic issues on the existing bridges?*

Doug Ficco – A seismic panel was put together and a report created that showed the bridges are susceptible to earthquakes because of their existing foundations.

--Sam Adams – *What is the cost of the project? Obviously, these are low confidence numbers.*

Doug Ficco – We don't know until our alternative is well defined. There are a lot of risks involved.

--Henry Hewitt – *The range depends on whether we are talking just about the bridge or interchanges as well as infrastructure. Some of the ambiguity comes from that.*

--Sam Adams – *To address comments raised during the public comment period, why are we narrowing options without a better understanding of the costs?*

John Osborn – We know supplemental and replacement are similar in costs so other aspects of the performance measures become more important.

--Sam Adams – *The staff recommendation doesn't meet a legal test of NEPA standards?*

Jay Lyman – It is the opinion of the Federal Highway Administration and other experts that we have a wide enough range. We have to use a process to consider what we will take forward, which we have done in the last year and a half, but the DEIS only needs one build and one no build.

--Royce Pollard – *We are concerned about impacts on downtown Vancouver too, about the size of the bridge and where it touches down. The right of way we have is what this will be operated within. In regards to environmental justice, I've anticipated that the DEIS will address those issues on both sides of the river.*

Motion: *Henry Hewitt – I'd like to ask for a motion to approve the staff recommendation to move forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'd like to have this be a beginning point to discuss the motion.*

Motion to amend: *Rex Burkholder – I'd like to make a motion to amend. The Metro resolution and amendment are before you. (Appendix 3). There are pieces here that reiterate what we want to focus on and also a fourth alternative that we've brought in. The challenge has been to find a low cost alternative that might reuse the existing bridges and meet the project Purpose and Need. We want to amend that the proposed alternatives move forward into DEIS but also that a subcommittee be established to come back at the next meeting with a fourth alternative for DEIS that retains the existing bridges.*

--Elson Strahan – *Were the 37 alternatives already considered not defined enough or is this option # 38? Will the process be held up until the feasibility of this new one is determined through the same methods that the earlier options were?*

--Rex Burkholder – Adding another alternative would allow the others to go forward. The amendment would charge the subcommittee to come back with an option based on retaining the existing bridges. It might use options already considered or a combination of them.

--Bob Russell – What is the involvement of staff in this, and what is the cost of evaluating another option? For consistency the staff should apply the same criteria as it did to the options that were already tested.

--Henry Hewitt - I took the motion to mean that the subcommittee would be staffed by staff.

--Tom Zelenka - There are components in this that have already gone through the screening process. In order to carry forward and implement, would we use the same criteria? How would we know that what emerged would be the basis of getting to some consensus?

--Rex Burkholder – Any suggestion would have to meet the Purpose and Need Statement. You would have to come up with something that in the judgment of this body would meet that. Whether we make that decision before the DEIS or after it when you have more data is up to this body.

--Jill Fuglister – Coalition for a Livable Future does not support the current recommendation in part because of a lack of information and a lack of costs. Having one big costly idea on the table is very risky. There is a lot of wisdom in trying to come up with another alternative. Who is on the committee? I like the working group model but would also like there to be experts in areas like urban design. Also, there are performance measures that have been used for evaluation which were not agreed upon. There are other measures that we could look at and add into the analysis.

--Rex Burkholder – Membership of the committee is up to task force, to the chair specifically.

--Steve Stuart – How much would it cost to put another alternative in compared to the potential cost of having an all or nothing scenario that fails? Cost we incur in creating another alternative is definitely less. We would have information to help us come up with a better Locally Preferred Alternative that is easier to reach consensus on. We have staff with that expertise to help us create something different. I don't know what the other idea would look like but I do know what we have and that we are not satisfied with it. Whoever wants another alternative needs to be involved in finding out what that is.

--Serena Cruz-Walsh – I appreciate Rex for bringing forward a compromise proposal. We assumed that something might happen to bring another option forward when we voted two months ago. The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners expressed support for the staff recommendation but also concern about the political viability of the project without including a broader range of voices.

--Jeff Hamm – Is there another alternative that meets the Purpose and Need? Of the 12 that were screened, five were supplemental options. We could add pricing or very heavy TDM and TSM too. The C-TRAN board of directors is supportive of the staff recommendation, but would like another alternative.

--Walter Valenta – I am in support of the Metro proposal. Even if you are decided, understand that we save time by listening to these other voices now. We don't know what another alternative is yet but we need to be open to the process. If we could have a strong vote here, we would get more political capital.

--Jonathan Schlueter – I would be receptive if I thought we missed something or if it would bring peace amongst the group. I don't know if I see that in this proposal. We have listened very carefully to the 37 options before and the difficulties of a supplemental option. Where is this going to meet the standards of public safety, freight mobility, commuter access, and capacity? What do we gain by retaining the existing spans or delivering an alternate span? The costs of construction go up every year we sit here. It is \$25 million a month by my calculation to have this conversation.

--Dave Frei – In regards to air quality and other factors that are based on information we don't know, the staff recommendation provides two choices. Staff leans on no-build to provide a choice. I am looking for an even based comparison between different alternatives that can meet the Purpose and Need. I'd like to have a fair decision that lets us balance quality of life of people on the corridor and road capacity.

--Sam Adams – Is the supplemental bridge an arterial bridge?

--Rex Burkholder – All it means is that there is currently not enough capacity on the existing bridges and something would be built to accommodate that. The subcommittee would figure out what that something is.

--Sam Adams – *There is a lack of specificity on what happens to the existing spans – should we be reading anything into that?*

--Rex Burkholder – *No.*

--Hal Dengerink – *We've had other alternatives considered, and nobody has come up with a decent alternative against staff recommendation. Metro basically proposes a modified Alternative #3 from the 12 packaged alternatives. Why wouldn't we take Metro's recommended alternative here?*

--Rex Burkholder – *It was a best guess at what we thought might work. I don't pretend to make this up and be sure we caught everything. I didn't want something so restrictive that a better alternative couldn't be developed. We tried to define something here, but didn't want to say that it is the only option.*

--Monica Isbell – *If we go forward with studying another alternative, what does that do in terms of federal appropriation of dollars?*

Doug Ficco – *It is important to keep on schedule to apply for the programs we are going for. There is less money in the next federal reauthorization. We will be a competitive project if we are ready to go. We have to look at funding sources besides just tolling, and this is the next best.*

John Osborn – *If we miss 2009, it is another six years before another authorization comes around. With the way the Northwest representatives are situated right now at the federal level, we are in a good place to influence things. We can't be sure what it will look like six years from now.*

--Henry Hewitt – *We would not want to interfere with this schedule by adding an alternative and I don't believe that we would. We're talking about a difference of months, not years.*

--Monica Isbell – *If we move forward with these options and then have some other option, how does that not put us off schedule? I am concerned that if we study more we aren't going to be able to get this project funded. How, in a month, can a group of people come up with something that takes precedence over the options that were already put forward?*

Motion to amend: *Fred Hansen – I might offer an amendment to this amendment. What alternatives we take into the DEIS are form issues that have to be evaluated. The tough decision is when we come out with an LPA and we should not have too much split now. I would propose an alternative that would seek to maximize the use of the existing bridges. Sub-option A would combine this with a mid-level bridge that would carry three through lanes only in each direction. For sub-option B a lower level bridge that would have a lift and not disrupt downtown Vancouver would be considered. High capacity transit would need to be included.*

--Henry Hewitt – *I don't think that we can define what this fourth alternative would look like through amendment.*

--Royce Pollard – *I like Fred's proposal less than I like Rex's. We could miss the only opportunity we have to provide for the future of our communities. I have the same concerns about cost and environmental. These things have to be looked at in the DEIS and they will be.*

--Lora Caine – *I went back to my people and they were concerned about having essentially a single option. I would support Rex's idea of going through other possibilities with staff and bringing back something to the this group so long as other recommendations go forward at the same time. We were told we had the opportunity to add back in. I would like to know that anyone could take part in the subcommittee if they like.*

--Jill Fuglister – *Coming back in a month seems like a short time frame. I am sensitive to the issues that have been raised with regard to the funding timeline, but a significant number of people are uncomfortable. I think there would be challenges with our delegation moving forward if this project is controversial. I hope that we wouldn't go forward with something too limited just to position ourselves to get money.*

--Steve Stuart – *There is a lot of concern over the money, but where is that money? FTA said that the timeline that the CRC staff has is not the one they are responsive to. Senator Murray's staff said to me that we should limit our expectations. The days of 90% share for these types of projects is over, it's more likely to be 50/50. There is a resolution in Olympia to help, but there has already been a raise in gas taxes already. I would much rather support what Rex is saying and take a month to reach consensus on this.*

--Mike Bennett-- *What happens after the month? What are the impacts on this process if we inject another option? What happens to the ones that are already started on DEIS?*

Doug Ficco-- *If something comes back in a month, we can react. 90/10 is still the interstate highway match, with less for transit. This project is not just a bridge project; it also includes transit, interchanges, and highway. We are trying to find a fourth option with just looking at the bridge. We need to look at the other portions of the project too. There are going to be impacts on schedule depending on when we get another alternative and how complex it looks. You can either extend the schedule or get more resources, and we are pretty tapped out on resources now.*

John Osborn -- *We can spend more time on this process, but the cost of the inflation per month is huge. Those are implications to face as well.*

--Walter Valenta -- *I find it a little troubling this idea that if we don't take the staff recommendation we will lose all the money. If we bring forward another reasonable option, we'll find the time and money still. We need to take time now to get a broader section of people on board so it doesn't take more time later. If the new bridge is the best choice, then it can handle another alternative being introduced.*

--Sam Adams -- *Given the scope of the charge for this subcommittee, is it doable in the next month?*

Doug Ficco -- *It is doable, we just need to make sure that it is a wise use of time.*

--Sam Adams-- *I think that there is benefit of this as an option even if it is not chosen. In spite of concerns I have about arterial impacts to local roadways, I think it is a good thing to have in this process.*

--Dean Lookingbill -- *If we support this amendment, then do we get another alternative into the DEIS?*

--Henry Hewitt -- *It means we support the staff recommendation, and then a separate committee will develop a fourth alternative and bring it back here for this group to vote on to move into the DEIS.*

--Larry Paulson -- *The alternative needs to speak to the freight issue -- not just across it but under it too. We have discussed many of the problems with a supplemental option at length. The spans' seismic state concerns me too.*

--Bob Knight -- *I have three concerns about the amendment. There is the impact on the ability to compete for federal money, a need for greater definition of the terms "low-cost" and "supplemental," and the significant environmental impacts of building another bridge on land that currently does not have a bridge on it. I think that we have taken our time so far -- if we turn this around in 30 days, it is too quick.*

--Monica Isbell -- *Can this resolution be split into a vote on the staff recommendation and another one on a different alternative? I also only feel comfortable if that one month timeline is firm. The resolution needs to be firmly written, and it isn't right now.*

--Rich Brown-- *The term "low cost alternative" has been used but that does not take into account the information we got in the presentation about the "cost of congestion."*

--Jill Fuglister-- *I'm not sure if it's feasible to have a new group form and get other experts to come in this 30 day timeline.*

--Steve Stuart -- *I do not have authority to vote for the three options moving forward if there is a possibility the fourth might not be approved. I don't want the perception that the staff may undermine a fourth alternative. If we can reach consensus on what to study, we will have more stability later.*

--Henry Hewitt- *As I understand it, if the amendment passes and the group comes back with something reasonable, it will be included.*

--Jeff Hamm -- *I wanted to clarify that the fourth alternative includes the supplemental bridge, but also TDM and TSM that haven't been applied yet.*

--Rex Burkholder- *I would want to defer to the work of the subcommittee on that.*

--Jerry Grossnickle -- *There is a fatal flaw to this alternative if we don't come back to fixing the rail bridge. Is that why it's in the Metro proposal?*

--Rex Burkholder -- *It is part of it.*

--Dave Frei – DEIS will address all the environmental justice issues I am concerned with, and will also study other issues that have been discussed like freight and capacity. I support pushing forward the current items, but I will have a tough time unless there is also something that moves forward to compare it to.

--Bob Byrd– Will it be possible to veto the fourth alternative?

--Rex Burkholder- I'd like to defer to the chair's description of the amendment. If the subcommittee comes up with something that meets the Purpose and Need statement, then it would be included.

--Henry Hewitt – We are going to discuss and debate it as well.

--Fred Hansen – I think that this amendment has to be taken in good faith. Unless there is a fatal flaw, it will move forward into the DEIS as part of the process of building consensus around the table.

--Henry Hewitt – There is tension here and I hope that we agree on something reasonable. We can't move forward without consensus.

--Elson Strahan – Is there some friendly language we could include about adding a fourth alternative developed by a subcommittee "as approved by the Task Force."

--Henry Hewitt – I don't think there is any way around us having to agree on what comes back in a month.

--Rex Burkholder – The real decision is going to be what the LPA is. I think that without another alternative we won't be able to agree. I understand that people want to move forward, but let's also work on trying to come up with a good fourth alternative. I hope this is a good faith effort. If it meets Purpose and Need, which is often a judgment call, it would go forward. I think Metro's skepticism is indicative of the general public's concerns. A lot of analysis has been done, and we can do a lot based on that work. At the end of the day, we are going to have a lot of analysis and we will still have to make a decision on this. A lot of bodies of authority will still have to agree.

--Henry Hewitt– What we are voting on is moving forward with the staff recommendation and adding a concept of a fourth alternative, that we will form a task force to form a fourth alternative, and we will have them report that back to our committee meeting in March with the expectation that if it is reasonable within the context of the conversation we are having, it will move forward into the DEIS process.

--Hal Dengerink – What the subcommittee comes up with is not going to be a terribly detailed recommendation, but what we have on the table currently staff are not either.

• **Action:** Vote on Burkholder amendment – passes with 26 for, 7 opposed, and no abstentions

• **Action:** Vote on motion as amended – passes with 33 for, none opposed, and no abstentions

7. Wrap Up and Next Steps

Subcommittee appointed to develop a fourth alternative to bring back to the Task Force in a month:

Rex Burkholder – Chair, Walter Valenta, Steve Stuart, Jeff Hamm, Dean Lookingbill, Fred Hansen, Tom Zelenka, Scot Walstra, and Fred Hansen, Hal Dengerink – ex officio, Henry Hewitt – ex officio

Dates of subcommittee meetings will be made available to group. All are welcomed to attend.

Next Task Force Meeting:

March 27, 4:00-6:30 p.m.

WSDOT, Southwest Region Office,
11018 NE 51st Circle, Vancouver, WA